

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 9, 11 and 15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4 are amended and claims 3, 5-7, 10 and 12-14 are canceled. No new matter has been added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Poon in the May 17, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Funada et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,742,408 in view of Heckman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,291,243. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Funada as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Barry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,859,711. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 4, recite in pertinent part:

a) a selecting means or step for selecting a piece of copy forgery preventing image data based on an image forming apparatus that is specified for forming the image from among the plurality of image forming apparatuses... and

b) the piece of copy forgery preventing image data includes at least a background portion constituted by a first pattern and a latent image portion constituted by a second pattern, and the background portion and the latent image portion are almost equal in density.

As discussed during the interview, the combinations of Funada and Heckman or Funada, Heckman and Barry each fail to teach or suggest, at least, the features of the independent claims identified above.

Funada is directed to an image processing apparatus "having a function of adding a particular pattern to a reproduced image." (See column 1, lines 13-16.) Funada teaches that the type of pattern added to copied documents is determined by the type of original being copied. If the image being copied is similar to particular kinds of originals that should not be

copied, such as securities, bank notes, confidential papers and the like, Funada teaches that the intensity of the added pattern is increased to make it visible. Funada further teaches that the pattern is weakened (so that it is not visible) or not even added to the other types of copied images. (See Funada, col. 6, lines 5-22 and col. 9, lines 24-31.)

Heckman is directed to systems for printing tamper-resistant plural-color documents. Heckman teaches the use of a safety background image pattern with at least a first color pattern and a second color pattern. The color patterns are "preferably oppositely varying density patterns of electronically generated pixel dot images with varying spaces therebetween." (See Heckman, column, lines 6-8 and column 5, lines 37-64.)

Barry is being cited for teaching the use of "a plurality of image forming apparatuses for printing wherein each of the plurality of image forming apparatuses corresponds to a different model to speed up the printing process." (See Office Action, page 15.)

As discussed during the interview, the combination of applied references do not teach or suggest selecting the copy forgery preventing image data based on a selected image forming apparatus that has been selected from a plurality of image forming apparatuses, as recited in claims 1 and 4. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's verbal indication that amended claims 1 and 4 including this feature overcome the current rejections.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Funada and Heckman do not teach or suggest copy forgery preventing image data that includes a background portion and a latent image portion, wherein the background portion and the latent image portion are almost equal in density because of Heckman's disclosure noted above that appears to teach away from this claimed feature.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1 and 4 and their dependent claims 9, 11 and 15 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Lynn E. Schwenning
Registration No. 37,233

JAO:LES/ccs

Attachment:
RCE Transmittal

Date: June 19, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--